(3)
CF-1001

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR (C.G.)

Writ Petition No. 350 /2004

Petitioner: Mohammad Farooq Ansari,
s/o Shri Mohd. Umar Ansari,
aged near about 59 years,
resident of Wadruff Nagar,
District Surguja.

Versus

Respondents:

1) State of Chhattisgarh through Secretary, Water Resources Department, D.K.S.Bhawan, Raipur, (C.G.)

2) Engineer-in-Chief, Water Resources Department, Raipur (C.G.)

3) Chief Engineer, Hasdeo Basin, Water Resources Department, Bilaspur, Dist. Bilaspur.

4) Superintending Engineer, Sham Barnai Project, Ambikapur, Dist. Surguja.

5) Executive Engineer, Water Resources Division No.2, Ambikapur, Dist. Surguja.

6) Shri S.C. Jain, S.D.O, Quality Control Sub-Division, Ambikapur, District Surguja.

P.R. No. 339/04
Presented by Shri ...
dated ...

Received
31/1/04
RECEIVED-COPY
Clerk to A. G. Bilaspur

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF WRIT IN THE NATURE OF CERTIORARI/MANDAMUS/PROHIBITIONS AND OTHER SUITABLE WRIT OR WRITS, DIRECTION OR DIRECTIONS AND ORDER OR ORDERS

1) Particulars of the Petitioner:

As detailed above in the cause title.

2) Particulars of the respondents:

As detailed above in the cause title.

XI-HC-22

(42)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P. No. 350/04 सन् 200

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	13.02.2004 Shri Manoj Paranjape, counsel for the petitioner. Shri Ranbir Singh, Govt. Advocate for the State/respondents. The petitioner has preferred this writ petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, challenging the order dated 18/01/2004 issued by respondent No.4, whereby the petitioner has been transferred without there being any exigency of service in order to accommodate respondent No.6, in the name of attaching the service of the petitioner from Ambikapur to Wadruff Nagar (Annexure P-6). Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has left only six months service because he is going to retire on 30/09/2004. He further submits that normally in the circumstances, as per the Government guidelines, an employee is not required to be transferred within 2 years from the date of his retirement and if in any case he is required to transfer, he should be transferred nearby the home district. He further submits that the petitioner may be allowed to make representation to respondent No.1, to which learned counsel for the State/respondents has no objection and in turn respondent No.1 may be directed to decide the representation after considering all the points raised by the petitioner. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and having regard to the fact that the petitioner is going to retire on 30/09/2004, the petitioner is allowed to make a detailed representation raising all his grievances within a period of 10 days from today to respondent No.1 and in turn respondent No.1 shall decide the representation of the petitioner with a reasoned order within a period of 30 days. In the meantime, if the petitioner is not already been relieved, he should not be relieved till the representation is decided.	

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P. No. 350/04 सन् 200

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित (2)	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	With the above directions the petition stands disposed of. In view of this order, M.W.P.No.307/2004 and I.A.No.823/2004 stand disposed of. Certified copy as per Rules. Sd/- L.C.BHADOO Judge	

Roshani
S.G.

9/185

[पीछे देखिये